arXiv:1411.4950v1 [math.AP] 18 Nov 2014

ENERGY-CRITICAL NLS WITH POTENTIALS OF QUADRATIC GROWTH

CASEY JAO

Abstract. We follow up our previous study of the energy-critical quantum harmonic oscillator [15]. Consider the global wellposedness problem for nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$i\partial_t u = [-\tfrac{1}{2}\Delta + V(x)]u \pm |u|^{4/(d-2)}u,\ u(0) \in \Sigma(\mathbf{R}^d),$$

where Σ is the weighted Sobolev space $H^1 \cap \mathcal{F}H^1$. The case $V(x) = \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$ was the subject of our previous paper. The present work extends the results obtained there to a class of "approximately quadratic" potentials (roughly speaking, V may vary between two quadratic potentials $\delta_1|x|^2 \leq V(x) \leq \delta_2|x|^2$ as long as it doesn't oscillate too rapidly).

We closely follow the concentration compactness argument used in [15] but need to modify a key step that exploited the classical Mehler formula for the fundamental solution of the harmonic oscillator. Instead, we appeal to a general oscillatory integral characterization of the propagator by Fujiwara, as well as oscillatory integral estimates due to Asada-Fujiwara.

1. Introduction

In a previous paper [15], we studied the large data global wellposedness problem for the energy-critical NLS with a harmonic oscillator potential:

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u = (-\frac{1}{2}\Delta + \frac{1}{2}|x|^2)u + \mu|u|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}u, \quad \mu = \pm 1, \\ u(0) = u_0 \in \Sigma(\mathbf{R}^d), \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where

$$\Sigma = \{f : \|f\|_\Sigma^2 := \|\nabla f\|_{L^2}^2 + \|xf\|_{L^2}^2 < \infty\}.$$

This note extends the results obtained there to more general potentials of quadratic growth.

Consider the Hamiltonian PDE

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u = (-\frac{1}{2}\Delta + V)u + \mu|u|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}u, \quad \mu = \pm 1, \\ u(0) = u_0 \in \Sigma(\mathbf{R}^d), \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

whose flow preserves the energy

$$E(u(t)) = \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \tfrac{1}{2}|\nabla u(t)|^2 + V|u(t)|^2 + \mu(1 - \tfrac{2}{d})|u(t)|^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}\,dx = E(u(0)).$$

The equation is *defocusing* if $\mu = 1$ and *focusing* if $\mu = -1$. The potential is assumed to satisfying th following three conditions:

(V1) $V = V(x)$ is smooth and nonnegative.
(V2) V is *subquadratic* in the sense that

$$\|\partial_x^k V\|_{L^\infty} \leq M_k \quad \text{for all} \quad k \geq 2.$$

(V3) $V(x) \geq \delta|x|^2$ for some $\delta > 0$.

These hypotheses on V ensure that

$$\delta|x|^2 \leq V(x) \leq \delta^{-1}(1+|x|^2)$$

for some constant $\delta > 0$. Therefore Σ is the energy space for the linear and defocusing problems, and is also the form domain $Q(H) = D(H^{1/2})$ for the positive operator $H = -\frac{1}{2}\Delta + V$. It will sometimes be more convenient to work with the norm

$$\|f\|_{Q(H)} := \|H^{1/2}f\|_{L^2} = (\|\nabla f\|_{L^2}^2 + \|V^{1/2}f\|_{L^2}^2)^{1/2},$$

because it is preserved by the propagator e^{-itH}. This norm is clearly equivalent to the original norm on Σ.

The adjective "energy-critical" refers to the fact that if we ignore the potential V in the equation, the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{aligned} (i\partial_t + \tfrac{1}{2}\Delta)u = \mu|u|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}u, \quad u(0) \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbf{R}^d) \\ E_\Delta(u) = \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \tfrac{1}{2}|\nabla u|^2 + \mu(1-\tfrac{2}{d})|u|^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}\,dx \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

is invariant under the scaling $u \mapsto u^\lambda(t,x) = \lambda^{-\frac{d-2}{2}}u(\lambda^{-2}t, \lambda^{-1}x)$. One makes this comparison because solutions to the equation (1.2) can be approximated by those to (1.3) in certain limiting regimes. Roughly speaking, if a solution u to (1.2) is highly concentrated at some point x_0, it sees the potential V as approximately a constant $V(x_0)$, and for short times the behavior of u is basically controlled by equation (1.3). We made this heuristic rigorous for the quadratic potential in [15]; see also Section 5.

Such concentrated solutions must be considered when studying the wellposedness of (1.2). Therefore, it is helpful to first understand the scale-invariant problem. That equation is hypothesized to have the following behavior:

Conjecture 1.1. *When $\mu = 1$, solutions to* (1.3) *exist globally and scatter. That is, for any $u_0 \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbf{R}^d)$, there exists a unique global solution $u : \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^d \to \mathbf{C}$ to* (1.3) *with $u(0) = u_0$, and this solution satisfies a spacetime bound*

$$S_{\mathbf{R}}(u) := \int_{\mathbf{R}} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} |u(t,x)|^{\frac{2(d+2)}{d-2}}\,dx\,dt \leq C(E_\Delta(u_0)) < \infty. \tag{1.4}$$

Moreover, there exist functions $u_\pm \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbf{R}^d)$ such that

$$\lim_{t \to \pm\infty} \|u(t) - e^{\pm\frac{it\Delta}{2}}u_\pm\|_{\dot{H}^1} = 0,$$

and the correspondences $u_0 \mapsto u_\pm(u_0)$ are homeomorphisms of $\dot{H}^1$.

When $\mu = -1$, one also has global wellposedness and scattering provided that

$$E_\Delta(u_0) < E_\Delta(W), \quad \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2},$$

where the ground state

$$W(x) = \frac{1}{(1+\frac{2|x|^2}{d(d-2)})^{\frac{d-2}{2}}} \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbf{R}^d)$$

solves the elliptic equation $\frac{1}{2}\Delta + |W|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}W = 0$.

This conjecture has been studied intensively over the last fifteen years, and we summarize the state of the art in the following

Theorem 1.1. *Conjecture 1.1 holds for the defocusing equation. For the focusing equation, the conjecture holds for radial initial data when $d \geq 3$, and for all initial data when $d \geq 5$.*

Proof. See [2, 6, 26, 29] for the defocusing case and [17, 21] for the focusing case. □

As the potentials under consideration cause the Hamiltonian to have purely discrete spectrum, one does not have global spacetime bounds of the form (1.4) even for the linear equation $i\partial_t u = (-\frac{1}{2}\Delta + V)u$. Moreover, the semilinear harmonic oscillator $i\partial_t u = (-\frac{1}{2}\Delta + \frac{1}{2}|x|^2)u + |u|^p u$ is known [4, Prop. 3.1] to have periodic-in-time solutions for $p < 4/(d-2)$. These considerations motivate the following

Conjecture 1.2. *When $\mu = 1$, equation (1.2) is globally wellposed. That is, for each $u_0 \in Q(H)$ there is a unique global solution $u : \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^d \to \mathbf{C}$ with $u(0) = u_0$. This solution obeys the spacetime bound*

$$S_I(u) := \int_I \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} |u(t,x)|^{\frac{2(d+2)}{d-2}}\, dx\, dt \leq C(|I|, \|u_0\|_\Sigma) \tag{1.5}$$

for any compact interval $I \subset \mathbf{R}$.

If $\mu = -1$, then the same is true provided also that

$$E(u_0) < E_\Delta(W) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}.$$

The restriction on the kinetic energy focusing case is necessary, for as in the case of the harmonic oscillator, we have:

Theorem 1.2. *If $\mu = -1$, $E(u_0) < E_\Delta(W)$, and $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$, then the solution to (1.2) blows up in finite time.*

To prove this one need only make notational changes to the discussion in [15, Section 7], and we refer the reader to there for details.

The main result of this paper extends our previous study [15], which considered the special potential $V(x) = \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$ for general data in the energy space, and in turn builded on the treatment of spherically symmetric data by Killip-Visan-Zhang [23]. As stated previously, our study of global wellposedness for equation (1.2) leans on the results for the scale-invariant equation. In the interest of succinctness we elect to state our main result as a conditional one; by Theorem 1.1, however, it is actually unconditional except in the focusing case for nonradial data in dimensions $d = 3$ and 4.

Theorem 1.3. *Assume Conjecture 1.1. Then Conjecture 1.2 holds.*

This paper also has an ancestor in the work of Carles [5], who considered a large class of subquadratic potentials for the energy-subcritical problem

$$i\partial_t u = (-\tfrac{1}{2}\Delta + V)u + \mu|u|^p u,\ p < \tfrac{4}{d-2}.$$

Taking initial data in Σ, he established global wellposedness in the defocusing case when $4/d \leq p < 4/(d-2)$ and in the focusing case when $0 < p < 4/d$. Carles did not require that V be bounded from below, and also allowed $V = V(t,x)$ to depend on time. Prior to that work, Oh [25] had shown large data global existence in the focusing case when $p < 4/d$ and the potential is time-independent and subquadratic.

We consider a more restricted class of potentials but focus on the subtleties at the exponent $p = 4/(d-2)$. In the absence of a potential, scale-invariance of the energy forces the guaranteed lifespan of local solutions to depend on the shape of

the initial data instead of just on its energy. Control of the energy alone therefore does not rule out blowup.

Although our equation does not actually have scaling symmetry, it nonetheless contains the same essential difficulties as in the scale-invariant problem. For if we take initial data of the form $u_0^\lambda = \lambda^{-(d-2)/2}\phi(\lambda^{-1}\cdot)$ for a fixed Schwartz function ϕ, and take λ very small, the energy $E(u_0^\lambda)$ barely depends on λ. In Section 5, we shall see that if u^λ is the solution to (1.2) with $u^\lambda(0) = u_0^\lambda$ and one restricts to a time window $|t| \lesssim \lambda^2$, then u^λ can be approximated in critical spacetime norms by v^λ, where $v^\lambda(t,x) = \lambda^{-(d-2)/2}v(\lambda^{-2}t, \lambda^{-1}x)$ solves the scale-invariant equation (1.3) with $v(0) = \phi$. Therefore, just as in the scale-invariant case, solutions to (1.2) with bounded energies can accumulate nontrivial spacetime norm over arbitrarily small time frames.

As in the case of the harmonic oscillator, to prove Theorem (1.2) we apply the modern incarnation of the induction on energy paradigm. This general strategy had been adapted previously to different critical equations [19, 20, 14, 13, 12, 24]. See also the list of references following Theorem 1.1 for the pioneering instances of induction on energy. The main ingredients of the argument are:

- **Stability theory**. One needs a statement to the following effect: if $\tilde{u}$ approximately solves equation (1.2) with error sufficiently small in Strichartz norms, then there is an *exact* solution u to (1.2) with the same initial data as $\tilde{u}$, and which is close to $\tilde{u}$ in critical spacetime norms.
- **Linear profile decomposition**. This provides a way to quantify the failure of compactness of the embedding
$$\begin{aligned} Q(H) &\to L_{t,loc,x}^{2(d+2)/(d-2)} \\ f &\mapsto e^{-itH}f, \end{aligned}$$
and provides a way to decompose a bounded sequence $\{f_n\}_n \subset Q(H)$ as $f_n = \sum_j \phi_n^j$, where the profiles ϕ_n^j are asymptotically pairwise independent and reflect the "symmetries" of the problem.
- **Analysis of scaling limits**. A typical profile in the profile decomposition will look something like $\phi_n = N_n^{(d-2)/2}\phi(N_n\cdot)$ where either $N_n \equiv 1$ or $\lim_n N_n = \infty$ (this is an oversimplification but captures the general idea). We will show that in the latter case, for n large enough the solution u_n to (1.2) with $u_n(0) = \phi_n$ behaves so similarly to a solution to the globally wellposed equation (1.3) that, by stability theory, u_n itself must have finite spacetime norm on a length-1 time interval. This essentially rules out blowup for equation (1.2) when the initial data is highly concentrated at a point.
- **Induction on energy**. Originally introduced by Bourgain [2] and refined by the "I-team" [6], Keraani [18], Kenig-Merle [17], and others, the idea is to assume that global wellposedness of (1.2) fails for some initial data, and consider the smallest energy E_c such that solutions u with $E(u) \geq E_c$ fail to exist globally. This energy threshold is positive by the small data theory. Using the profile decomposition, the induction hypothesis that solutions with energy smaller than E_c do exist globally, and the scaling limit analysis, one proves the existence of a blowup solution u_c with energy $E(u_c) = E_c$, and which must simultaneously obey an impossibly strong compactness property.

We import the arguments given for the harmonic oscillator in [15], making mostly notational changes save for one key difference. There, we exploited the classical formula for the linear fundamental solution:

$$e^{-itH}(x,y) = \tfrac{1}{(2\pi i \sin t)^{d/2}} e^{\frac{i}{\sin t}(\frac{x^2+y^2}{2}\cos t - xy)} \quad \text{(Mehler's Formula [7])}. \tag{1.6}$$

No such explicit formula is available for more general potentials. Nonetheless, Fujiwara showed [9, 10] that for a rather general class of subquadratic potentials, the propagator e^{-itH} can be represented for small t as an oscillatory integral operator

$$e^{-itH} f(x) = \tfrac{1}{(2\pi i t)^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} k(t,x,y) e^{iS(t,x,y)} f(y)\, dy,$$

where for small t the integral kernel is close to that of the free propagator $e^{\frac{it\Delta}{2}}$ in a quantitative sense. In fact, Fujiwara considered time-dependent potentials.

Using this representation and some basic facts about oscillatory integrals due to Asada-Fujiwara [1], we are able to obtain suitable replacements for the steps in [15] that relied on the precise form of Mehler's formula.

Outline of paper. In Section 2 we set our notation and review some basic estimates regarding equation (1.2). We also recall Fujiwara's construction of the propagator as an oscillatory integral and record some oscillatory integral estimates of Asada-Fujiwara. Section 3 states some standard (but vital) local theory. Section 4 discusses the linear profile decomposition mentioned above, focusing on how to modify the arguments that previously invoked Mehler's formula.

The scaling limit analysis of Section 5 and the compactness arguments of Section 6 parallel the ones given in [15]. As will be the case throughout the paper, we describe mainly the required adjustments and refer to [15] for the rest of the details.

Acknowledgements. The author is indebted to his advisors Rowan Killip and Monica Visan for their helpful discussions as well as their feedback on the paper. This work was supported in part by NSF grants DMS-0838680 (RTG), DMS-1265868 (PI R. Killip), DMS-0901166, and DMS-1161396 (both PI M. Visan).

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Notation and basic estimates.** We write $X \lesssim Y$ to mean $X \leq CY$ for some constant C. Similarly $X \sim Y$ means $X \lesssim Y$ and $Y \lesssim X$. Denote by $L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ the Banach space of functions $f : \mathbf{R}^d \to \mathbf{C}$ with finite norm

$$\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)} = \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} |f|^p \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

We will sometimes use the more compact notation $\|f\|_p$. If $I \subset \mathbf{R}^d$ is an interval, the mixed Lebesgue norms on $I \times \mathbf{R}^d$ are defined by

$$\|f\|_{L_t^q L_x^r(I\times\mathbf{R}^d)} = \left(\int_I \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} |f(t,x)|^r \, dx \right)^{\frac{q}{r}} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} = \|f(t)\|_{L_t^q(I;L_x^r(\mathbf{R}^d))},$$

where one regards $f(t) = f(t,\cdot)$ as a function from I to $L^r(\mathbf{R}^d)$.

Throughout the paper we shall use the capital letters D and X to denote the operators $f \mapsto -i\partial f$ and $f \mapsto xf$, respectively.

Introduce the following function spaces

$$\mathcal{B}_k(\mathbf{R}^n) = \{f \in C^\infty(\mathbf{R}^n) : D^\ell f \in L^\infty \text{ for all } \ell \geq k\},$$
$$\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R}^n) = \mathcal{B}_0(\mathbf{R}^n)$$

The notation $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R}^d)$ goes back to Schwartz [27] and is equivalent to the more modern notation $S^0_{0,0}$, where in general $S^k_{\rho,\delta}(\mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R}^d)$ denotes the smooth symbols on $\mathbf{R}^d_x \times \mathbf{R}^d_\xi$ such that

$$D^\beta_x D^\alpha_\xi p(x,\xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta}\langle\xi\rangle^{m-|\alpha|\rho+|\beta|\delta}$$

for all multiindices α and β. Note, however, that in general $\mathcal{B}_k$ does not coincide with any $S^k_{\rho,\delta}$.

We recall Fujiwara's construction of the fundamental solution for H. Recall that the symbol $H(\xi,x) = \frac{1}{2}|\xi|^2 + V(x)$ defines the Hamiltonian flow

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = \nabla_\xi H, \quad \dot{\xi} = -\nabla_x H \\ (x(0),\xi(0)) = (y,\eta). \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Suppose that V is subquadratic in the sense that $|D^k V(x)| \leq C_k$ for all $k \geq 2$. Then the vector field $(-\nabla_x H, \nabla_\xi H)$ is Lipschitz, hence complete, and we may regard x and ξ as well-defined functions $x(t,y,\eta),\ \xi(t,y,\eta)$ of t and the initial data.

Proposition 2.1 ([9, Proposition 1.7])**.** *Let V be a subquadratic potential in the sense that $|D^k V(x)| \leq C_k$ for all $k \geq 2$, and put $H(\xi,x) = \frac{1}{2}|\xi|^2 + V(x)$. Then the map $(y,\eta) \mapsto (x,y)$ obeys the derivative estimates*

$$\tfrac{\partial x}{\partial y} = I + t^2 a(t,y,\eta), \quad \tfrac{\partial x}{\partial \eta} = t(I + t^2 b(t,y,\eta))$$

for some matrix-valued $a, b \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R}^d_y \times \mathbf{R}^d_\eta)$.

Further, there exists δ_0 such that whenever $0 \neq |t| \leq \delta_0$, for pairs $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^d$ there is a unique trajectory $(x(\tau),\xi(\tau))$ such that $x(0) = y$ and $x(t) = x$.

Remark. To get the second statement from the first, one invokes the Hadamard global inverse function theorem to see that $(y,\eta) \mapsto (x,y)$ is a diffeomorphism for $0 \neq t$ sufficiently small.

According to this result, when $|t| \leq \delta_0$ and $t \neq 0$ we can define the *action*

$$S(t,x,y) = \int_0^t \frac{1}{2}|\xi(\tau)|^2 - V(x(\tau))\, d\tau, \tag{2.2}$$

where $(x(\tau),\xi(\tau))$ is the unique trajectory with $x(0) = y$ and $x(t) = x$.

Theorem 2.2 (Fundamental solution [9, 10])**.** *Let V be subquadratic as in the previous proposition. Then there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that:*

- *The action $S(t,x,y)$ is well-defined by (2.2) for all $0 < |t| < \delta_0$ and satisfies*

  $$S(t,x,y) = \tfrac{|x-y|^2}{2t} + t\omega(t,x,y),$$

  where the term $\omega(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ belongs to $\mathcal{B}_2$ uniformly for $|t| \leq \delta_0$. That is, there exist constants C_k such that

  $$|D^k_{x,y}\omega(t,x,y)| \leq C_k(1 + |x| + |y|)^{\max(2-k,0)}$$

  for all k.

- *For all* $0 < |t| < \delta_0$ *and all* $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d)$ *we have*

$$e^{-itH} f(x) = \tfrac{1}{(2\pi i t)^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} e^{iS(t,x,y)} a(t,x,y) f(y)\, dy,$$

where

$$\|D_{x,y}^k [a(t,\cdot,\cdot) - 1]\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d_x \times \mathbf{R}^d_y)} = O_k(t^2) \quad \text{for all} \quad k \geq 0.$$

The above integral representation immediately yields a dispersive estimate:

Corollary 2.3 (Dispersive estimate)**.** *For* $|t| \leq \delta_0$*, we have*

$$\|e^{-itH} f\|_\infty \lesssim |t|^{-\frac{d}{2}} \|f\|_1.$$

We call a pair (q,r) *admissible* if $q \geq 2$ and $\frac{2}{q} + \frac{d}{r} = \frac{d}{2}$. Define the norm

$$\|u\|_{S(I)} := \|u\|_{L_t^2 L_x^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}(I \times \mathbf{R}^d)} + \|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2 (I \times \mathbf{R}^d)}.$$

By interpolation, this norm controls $\|u\|_{L_t^q L_x^r}$ for all admissible pairs (q,r). Define

$$\|F\|_{N(I)} = \inf\{\|F_1\|_{L_t^{q_1'} L_x^{r_1'}} + \|F_2\|_{L_t^{q_2'} L_x^{r_2'}} : (q_k, r_k) \text{ admissible}, F = F_1 + F_2\}$$

where (q_k', r_k') denotes the Hölder dual of (q_k, r_k).

Lemma 2.4 (Strichartz [16])**.** *Let* I *be a compact time interval containing* t_0*, and let* $u : I \times \mathbf{R}^d \to \mathbf{C}$ *be a solution to the inhomogeneous Schrödinger equation*

$$(i\partial_t - H)u = F.$$

Then there is a constant C*, depending only on the length of the interval* I*, such that*

$$\|u\|_{S(I)} \leq C(\|u_0\|_{L^2} + \|F\|_{N(I)}).$$

Proof. This follows from [16] as a consequence of two ingredients: the dispersive estimate of the previous corollary, and the unitarity of e^{-itH} on $L^2(\mathbf{R}^d)$. □

As V is nonnegative, we have access to the following spectral multipler theorem due to Hebisch [11]:

Theorem 2.5. *If* $F : (0,\infty) \to \mathbf{C}$ *is a bounded function which obeys the derivative estimates*

$$|\partial^k F(\lambda)| \lesssim_k |\lambda|^{-k} \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 \leq k \leq \tfrac{d}{2} + 1,$$

then the operator $F(H)$*, defined initially on* L^2 *by the Borel functional calculus, is bounded from* L^p *to* L^p *for all* $1 < p < \infty$*.*

The following norm equivalence was first proven for the quadratic potential by Killip-Visan-Zhang [23, Lemma 2.7]. Using the coercivity hypothesis (V3), we adapt their result to the potentials considered here.

Proposition 2.6 (Equivalence of norms)**.** *For any* $1 < p < \infty$ *and* $s \in [0,1]$*, we have*

$$\|H^s f\|_p \sim_{p,s} \|(-\Delta)^s f\|_p + \|V^s f\|_p$$

for all Schwartz functions f*.*

To prove this we shall need the following fact, which is classical when V is quadratic; we verify it at the end for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $H = -\frac{1}{2}\Delta + V$ where V satisfies the hypotheses (V1) through (V3). Then the space of smooth vectors for H is precisely Schwartz class:*

$$D(H^\infty) := \bigcap_{n \geq 0} D(H^n) = \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}^d).$$

Proof of Proposition 2.6. We show first that

$$\|(-\Delta)^s f\|_p + \|V^s f\|_p \lesssim_p \|H^s f\|_p \quad \text{for all} \quad f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}^d). \tag{2.3}$$

As $f = H^{-s}H^s f$ and $H^s f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ by Lemma 2.7, it suffices to prove

$$\|(-\Delta)^s H^{-s} f\|_p + \|V^s H^{-s} f\|_p \lesssim_p \|f\|_p \quad \text{for all} \quad f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}^d). \tag{2.4}$$

By hypothesis, there is some $\delta > 0$ such that $V(x) \geq \delta|x|^2$. Killip-Visan-Zhang [23] proved that

$$\|V^s H_\delta^{-s} f\|_p \lesssim_p \|f\|_p,$$

where $H_\delta = -\frac{1}{2}\Delta + \delta|x|^2$. On the other hand, the parabolic maximium principle implies

$$0 \leq e^{-tH}(x,y) \leq e^{-tH_\delta}(x,y)$$

Combining this with the identity

$$H^{-s}(x,y) = \tfrac{1}{\Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty e^{-tH}(x,y) t^{s-1} dt,$$

we obtain the kernel inequality

$$0 \leq H^{-s}(x,y) \leq H_\delta^{-s}(x,y)$$

In particular, $V^s H^{-s}$ and $V^s H_\delta^{-s}$ have nonnegative integral kernels. We may therefore bound

$$\|V^s H^{-s} f\|_p \leq \|V^s H^{-s}|f|\|_p \leq \|V^s H_\delta^{-s}|f|\|_p \lesssim_p \|f\|_p.$$

This yields half of (2.4). Specializing to the case $s = 1$ and writing $-\Delta = 2(H - V)$, we obtain

$$\|(-\Delta)H^{-1} f\|_p \lesssim_p \|f\|_p. \tag{2.5}$$

The rest of the argument is imported directly from [23], and is included to make the discussion self-contained. To show that $\|(-\Delta)^s H^{-s} f\|_p \lesssim_p \|f\|_p$ for all $s \in [0,1]$, we use analytic interpolation. It suffices to verify that

$$|\langle (-\Delta)^z H^{-z} f, g\rangle_{L^2}| \leq C\|f\|_p \|g\|_{p'}$$

for all Schwartz f and g. By homogeneity, we may assume $\|f\|_p = \|g\|_{p'} = 1$. Put

$$F(z) = \langle (-\Delta)^z H^{-z} f, g\rangle_{L^2}.$$

By the spectral theorm, $F(z)$ is bounded and continuous on the closed strip $\{0 \leq \mathrm{Re}(z) \leq 1\}$ and analytic on its interior. By the special case (2.5) and Theorem 2.5,

$$|F(it)| \leq \|(-\Delta)^{it} H^{-it} f\|_p \leq C_0$$
$$|F(1+it)| \leq \|(-\Delta)^{it}(-\Delta)H^{-1}H^{-it} f\|_p \leq C_1.$$

Hadamard's three-lines lemma implies that $|F(z)| \leq C$ on the whole strip. Thus (2.3) and (2.4) hold for all $p \in (1,\infty)$ and $s \in [0,1]$.

Dualizing those estimates yields

$$\|H^{-s}(-\Delta)^s f\|_p + \|H^{-s}V^s f\|_p \lesssim_{p,s} \|f\|_p \quad \text{for all} \quad p \in (1,\infty),\ s \in [0,1]$$

Writing $H^s f = H^{s-1} H f = \frac{1}{2} H^{s-1}(-\Delta)^{1-s}(-\Delta)^s f + H^{s-1} V^{1-s} V^s f$, we have

$$\|H^s f\|_p \lesssim_{p,s} \|(-\Delta)^s f\|_p + \|V^s f\|_p \quad \text{for all} \quad p \in (1,\infty),\ s \in [0,1].$$

This completes the proof of the proposition modulo the lemma. □

Proof of Lemma 2.7. The inclusion $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}^d) \subset D(H^\infty)$ is clear. To prove the opposite inclusion, we show by an induction argument the equivalent assertion that

$$D(H^\infty) \subset \bigcap_{k \geq 0} \{u : x^\alpha \partial^\beta u \in L^2 \text{ for all } |\alpha| + |\beta| \leq k\}. \tag{2.6}$$

We have the following identities:

$$\begin{aligned} H\partial_j u &= \partial_j H u - (\partial_j V) u \\ Hmu &= mHu - \tfrac{1}{2}(\Delta m)u - \nabla m \cdot \nabla u \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

Define for each $n \geq 1$ the following statements:

$$\begin{aligned} P_1(n) &= \text{“}m : D(H^{n-1}) \to D(H^{n-1}) \text{ for all } m \in \mathcal{B}\text{”} \\ P_2(n) &= \text{“}\partial_j : D(H^n) \to D(H^{n-1})\text{”} \\ P_3(n) &= \text{“}\partial_j V : D(H^n) \to D(H^{n-1})\text{”}. \end{aligned}$$

As $D(H) \subset D(H^{1/2}) = \{u : \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|xu\|_{L^2} < \infty\}$, these hold for $n = 1$.

Assume that they hold for some n. For $u \in D(H^n)$ and $m \in \mathcal{B}$, use (2.7) and the statements $P_1(n),\ P_2(n)$ to see that $H(mu) \in D(H^{n-1})$, so $mu \in D(H^n)$ and $P_1(n+1)$ holds since m was chosen arbitrarily in $\mathcal{B}$. Similar reasoning shows that $P_2(n)$ and $P_3(n)$ imply $P_2(n+1)$, and that $P_1(n),\ P_2(n),\ P_3(n)$ yield $P_3(n+1)$. Hence, by induction these statements hold for all $n \geq 1$.

Next, apply (2.4) in the special case $s = 1,\ p = 2$ to see that

$$V : D(H) \to D(H^0) = L^2.$$

Suppose $u \in D(H^n)$ and $n \geq 2$. We have

$$H(Vu) = VHu - \tfrac{1}{2}(\Delta V)u - \nabla V \cdot \nabla u.$$

By induction, $VHu \in D(H^{n-2})$, while $P_1(n),\ P_2(n)$, and $P_3(n-1)$ imply that the second and third terms also belong to $D(H^{n-2})$. Thus $Vu \in D(H^{n-1})$

Summing up, we find that

$$V : D(H^n) \to D(H^{n-1}) \text{ for all } n \geq 1.$$

These mapping properties, together with the coercivity hypothesis (V3), immediately yield the claim (2.6). □

Thanks to this norm equivalence, H^γ inherits many properties of the fractional derivative $(-\Delta)^\gamma$, including Sobolev embedding:

Lemma 2.8 ([23, Lemma 2.8])**.** *Suppose $\gamma \in [0,1]$ and $1 < p < \frac{d}{2\gamma}$, and define p^* by $\frac{1}{p^*} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{2\gamma}{d}$. Then*

$$\|f\|_{L^{p^*}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \lesssim \|H^\gamma f\|_{L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)}.$$

Similarly, the fractional chain and product rules carry over to the current setting:

Corollary 2.9 ([23, Proposition 2.10])**.** *Let* $F(z) = |z|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}z$*. For any* $0 \leq \gamma \leq \frac{1}{2}$ *and* $1 < p < \infty$*,*

$$\|H^\gamma F(u)\|_{L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)} \lesssim \|F'(u)\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbf{R}^d)}\|H^\gamma f\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbf{R}^d)}$$

for all $p_0, p_1 \in (1, \infty)$ *with* $p^{-1} = p_0^{-1} + p_1^{-1}$*.*

Using Proposition 2.6 and the Christ-Weinstein fractional product rule for $(-\Delta)^\gamma$ (e.g. [28]), we obtain

Corollary 2.10. *For* $\gamma \in (0, 1]$*,* $r, p_i, q_i \in (1, \infty)$ *with* $r^{-1} = p_i^{-1} + q_i^{-1}$*,* $i = 1, 2$*, we have*

$$\|H^\gamma(fg)\|_r \lesssim \|H^\gamma f\|_{p_1}\|g\|_{q_1} + \|f\|_{p_2}\|H^\gamma g\|_{q_2}.$$

2.2. **FIO technology.** We recall some properties of Fourier integral operators tailored to the Schrödinger equation. The operators we shall use were developed by Fujiwara [8] and Asada-Fujiwara [1].

Definition 2.1. We say a smooth function ϕ is a *phase* if $\phi \in \mathcal{B}_2(\mathbf{R}^d_x \times \mathbf{R}^d_y)$ and satisfies the nondegeneracy condition

$$\inf_{x,y} |\det D^2_{xy}\phi(x, y)| > 0. \tag{2.8}$$

Given a phase $\phi(x, y)$ and an amplitude $a(x, y) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R}^d_x \times \mathbf{R}^d_y)$, we define for each $\lambda \neq 0$ the integral operator

$$A(\lambda)f(x) = \left(\frac{\lambda}{2\pi i}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} e^{i\lambda\phi(x,y)}a(x, y)f(y)dy. \tag{2.9}$$

Remark. Asada and Fujiwara studied more general oscillatory integral operators of the form

$$f \mapsto \left(\frac{\lambda}{2\pi i}\right)^{\frac{m+n}{2}} \int_{\mathbf{R}^m}\int_{\mathbf{R}^n} e^{i\phi(x,\theta,y)}a(x, \theta, y)f(y)\, dyd\theta$$

where $a(x, \theta, y) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R}^n_x \times \mathbf{R}^m_\theta \times \mathbf{R}^n_y)$ and the phase ϕ satisfies the nondegeneracy condition

$$\left|\det \begin{pmatrix} D^2_{xy}\phi & D^2_{x\theta}\phi \\ D^2_{\theta y}\phi & D^2_{\theta\theta}\phi \end{pmatrix}\right| \geq \delta$$

The integral operator $A(\lambda)$ considered above corresponds to the case $m = 0$.

The operator $A(\lambda)$ is bounded on L^2. More precisely, Fujiwara proved:

Theorem 2.11 (Fujiwara [8])**.** $\|A(\lambda)\|_{L^2\to L^2} \leq C\|a\|_{C^{2d+1}}$

Let ϕ be a phase function. By the global inverse function theorem, the maps

$$\chi_1(x, y) = (y, -\partial_y\phi) \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_2(x, y) = (x, \partial_x\phi)$$

are diffeomorphisms of $\mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R}^d$. It follows that the relation

$$(y, -\partial_y\phi) \mapsto (x, y) \mapsto (x, \partial_x\phi)$$

defines a diffeomorphism

$$\chi = \chi_2 \circ \chi_1^{-1} : \mathbf{R}^d_y \times \mathbf{R}^d_\eta \to \mathbf{R}^d_x \times \mathbf{R}^d_\xi,$$

which is easily checked to be canonical in the sense that $d\xi \wedge dx = d\eta \wedge dy$. The map $\chi(y, \eta) = (x(y, \eta), \xi(y, \eta))$ is the canonical transformation generated by the phase function $\phi(x, y)$.

For a smooth symbol $p \in \mathcal{B}_k(\mathbf{R}^d_x \times \mathbf{R}^d_\theta \times \mathbf{R}^d_y)$ and $\lambda \neq 0$, let $\mathrm{Op}(p,\lambda)$ denote the the (semiclassical) pseudodifferential operator

$$\mathrm{Op}(p,\lambda)f(x) = \left(\frac{\lambda}{2\pi}\right)^d \iint e^{i\lambda(x-y)\theta} p(x,\theta,y) f(y)\, dy d\theta.$$

These operators obey the following Egorov-type relation:

Theorem 2.12 ([1, Theorem 6.1]). *Let $\phi(x,y)$ be a phase function, $a(x,y) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R}^d)$, be an amplitude, and $A(\lambda)$ the corresponding Fourier integral operator. Let $\chi : \mathbf{R}^{2d} \to \mathbf{R}^{2d}$ be the canonical transformation generated by ϕ. Let $p(x,\theta,y),\ q(x,\theta,y) \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R}^d)$ be such that*

$$q(y,\eta,y) = p(x,\xi,x)|_{(x,\xi)=\chi(y,\eta)}$$

Then

$$\mathrm{Op}(\lambda p,\lambda)A(\lambda) - A(\lambda)\,\mathrm{Op}(\lambda q,\lambda) = R(\lambda),$$

for some Fourier integral operator $R(\lambda)$ with phase function ϕ. The operator norm of $R(\lambda)$ satisfies

$$\|R(\lambda)\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \lesssim \lambda^{-1} \|a\|_{0,M} (\|p\|_{1,M} + \|q\|_{1,M})$$

for some positive integer M, where

$$\|f\|_{r,s} = \sup_{r \leq k \leq s} \|D^k f\|_{L^\infty}.$$

3. Local Theory

We record some standard local-wellposedness results for (1.2). These are direct translations of the theory for the scale-invariant equation (1.3). By Lemma 2.8 and Corollaries 2.9 and 2.10, essentially the same proofs as in that case will work here. We refer the reader to [22] for those proofs.

Proposition 3.1 (Local wellposedness). *Let $u_0 \in \Sigma(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and fix a compact time interval $0 \in I \subset \mathbf{R}$. Then there exists a constant $\eta_0 = \eta_0(d, |I|)$ such that whenever $\eta < \eta_0$ and*

$$\|H^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-itH} u_0\|_{L_t^{\frac{2(d+2)}{d-2}} L_x^{\frac{2d(d+2)}{d^2+4}}(I \times \mathbf{R}^d)} \leq \eta,$$

there exists a unique solution $u : I \times \mathbf{R}^d \to \mathbf{C}$ to (1.1) which satisfies the bounds

$$\|H^{\frac{1}{2}} u\|_{L_t^{\frac{2(d+2)}{d-2}} L_x^{\frac{2d(d+2)}{d^2+4}}(I \times \mathbf{R}^d)} \leq 2\eta \quad \text{and} \quad \|H^{\frac{1}{2}} u\|_{S(I)} \lesssim \|u_0\|_\Sigma + \eta^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}.$$

Corollary 3.2 (Blowup criterion). *Suppose $u : (T_{min}, T_{max}) \times \mathbf{R}^d \to \mathbf{C}$ is a maximal lifespan solution to (1.1), and fix $T_{min} < t_0 < T_{max}$. If $T_{max} < \infty$, then*

$$\|u\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2(d+2)}{d-2}}([t_0, T_{max}))} = \infty.$$

If $T_{min} > -\infty$, then

$$\|u\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2(d+2)}{d-2}}((T_{min}, t_0])} = \infty.$$

Proposition 3.3 (Stability). *Fix $t_0 \in I \subset \mathbf{R}$ an interval of unit length and let $\tilde{u} : I \times \mathbf{R}^d \to \mathbf{C}$ be an approximate solution to (1.1) in the sense that*

$$i\partial_t \tilde{u} = Hu \pm |\tilde{u}|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}\tilde{u} + e$$

for some function e. Assume that

$$\|\tilde{u}\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2(d+2)}{d-2}}} \leq L, \quad \|H^{\frac{1}{2}}u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \leq E, \tag{3.1}$$

and that for some $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0(E, L)$ one has

$$\|H^{1/2}(\tilde{u}(t_0) - u_0)\|_{L^2} + \|H^{\frac{1}{2}}e\|_{N(I)} \leq \varepsilon, \tag{3.2}$$

Then there exists a unique solution $u : I \times \mathbf{R}^d \to \mathbf{C}$ to (1.1) with $u(t_0) = u_0$ and which further satisfies the estimates

$$\|\tilde{u} - u\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2(d+2)}{d-2}}} + \|H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\tilde{u} - u)\|_{S(I)} \lesssim C(E, L)\varepsilon^c \tag{3.3}$$

where $0 < c = c(d) < 1$ and $C(E, L)$ is a function which is nondecreasing in each variable.

4. Concentration compactness

Let $0 \in I$ be a compact interval so that $|I| \leq \delta_0$, where δ_0 is the constant in Theorem 2.2. As is now standard in the analysis of energy-critical equations, the induction on energy argument relies on a linear profile decomposition for the Strichartz inequality

$$\|e^{-itH}f\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2(d+2)}{d-2}}(I\times\mathbf{R}^d)} \lesssim \|H^{1/2}f\|_{L^2}.$$

In [15] we obtained such a decomposition when $H = -\frac{1}{2}\Delta + \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$. Let us highlight the main modification required to adapt that proof to the present setting. One of the key steps in both proofs is to compare the linear evolutions of a spatially localized initial state under the propagators e^{-itH} and $e^{\frac{it\Delta}{2}}$ with and without a potential, respectively (see Proposition 4.4 below). For the harmonic oscillator we relied on the Mehler formula to decompose

$$e^{-itH} = m_t(X)e^{i\frac{\sin(t)\Delta}{2}}m_t(X)$$

where $m_t(x) = \exp(i(\frac{\cos t - 1}{2\sin t})x^2)$. While this factorization clearly manifests the relation between the two propagators, a more robust method is needed to deal with the more general potentials considered here. Instead we work directly with the integral representation from Theorem (2.2) and apply oscillatory integral estimates.

The rest of the strategy for the harmonic oscillator can be imported after essentially notational changes. We shall state the main definitions and lemmas to indicate the general flow but refer to [15] for their proofs.

Definition 4.1. A *frame* is a sequence $(t_n, x_n, N_n) \in I \times \mathbf{R}^d \times 2^{\mathbf{N}}$ conforming to one of the following scenarios:

(1) $N_n \equiv 1$, $t_n \equiv 0$, and $x_n \equiv 0$.
(2) $N_n \to \infty$ and $N_n^{-1}V(x_n)^{1/2} \to r_\infty \in [0, \infty)$.

Remark. The quantity $N_n^{-1}V(x_n)^{1/2}$ is the analog of the ratio $N_n^{-1}|x_n|$ that was considered in [15].

These parameters will specify the temporal center, spatial center, and (inverse) length scale of a function. The hypothesis that V grows essentially quadratically ensures that $|x_n| \lesssim N_n$, which reflects the fact that we only consider functions obeying some uniform bound in $Q(H)$, and such functions cannot be centered arbitrarily far from the origin. We need to augment the frame $\{(t_n, x_n, N_n)\}$ with an auxiliary parameter N_n', which corresponds to a sequence of spatial cutoffs adapted to the frame.

Definition 4.2. An *augmented frame* is a sequence $(t_n, x_n, N_n, N_n') \in I \times \mathbf{R}^d \times 2^{\mathbf{N}} \times \mathbf{R}$ belonging to one of the following types:

(1) $N_n \equiv 1,\ t_n \equiv 0,\ x_n \equiv 0,\ N_n' \equiv 1.$
(2) $N_n \to \infty,\ N_n^{-1} V(x_n)^{1/2} \to r_\infty \in [0, \infty)$, and either
  (2a) $N_n' \equiv 1$ if $r_\infty > 0$, or
  (2b) $N_n^{1/2} \leq N_n' \leq N_n,\ N_n^{-1} V(x_n)^{1/2} (\frac{N_n}{N_n'}) \to 0$, and $\frac{N_n}{N_n'} \to \infty$ if $r_\infty = 0$.

The frame $\{(t_n, x_n, N_n)\}$ is the *underlying frame*.

Given an augmented frame (t_n, x_n, N_n, N_n'), we define scaling and translation operators on functions of space and of spacetime by

$$\begin{aligned} (G_n \phi)(x) &= N_n^{\frac{d-2}{2}} \phi(N_n(x - x_n)) \\ (\tilde{G}_n f)(t, x) &= N_n^{\frac{d-2}{2}} f(N_n^2(t - t_n), N_n(x - x_n)). \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

We also define spatial cutoff operators S_n by

$$S_n \phi = \begin{cases} \phi, & \text{for frames of type 1} \quad (\text{i.e. } N_n \equiv 1), \\ \chi(\frac{N_n}{N_n'} \cdot) \phi, & \text{for frames of type 2} \quad (\text{i.e. } N_n \to \infty), \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

where χ is a smooth compactly supported function equal to 1 on the ball $\{|x| \leq 1\}$. An easy computation yields the following mapping properties of these operators:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \to \infty} S_n = I \text{ strongly in } \dot{H}^1 &\text{and in } Q(H), \\ \limsup_{n \to \infty} \|G_n\|_{Q(H) \to Q(H)} &< \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

The following technical lemma is the counterpart of [15, Lemma 4.2] and is proved in the same manner (in particular we use the equivalence of norms furnished by Proposition 2.6).

Lemma 4.1 (Approximation)**.** *Let (q, r) be an admissible pair of exponents with $2 \leq r < d$, and let $\mathcal{F} = \{(t_n, x_n, N_n, N_n')\}$ be an augmented frame of type 2.*

(1) *Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is of type (2a) in Definition 4.2. Then for $\{f_n\} \subseteq L_t^q H_x^{1,r}(\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^d)$, we have*

$$\limsup_n \|H^{1/2} \tilde{G}_n S_n f_n\|_{L_t^q L_x^r} \lesssim \limsup_n \|f_n\|_{L_t^q H_x^{1,r}}.$$

(2) *Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is of type (2b) and $f_n \in L_t^q \dot{H}_x^{1,r}(\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^d)$. Then*

$$\limsup_n \|H^{1/2} \tilde{G}_n S_n f_n\|_{L_t^q L_x^r} \lesssim \limsup_n \|f_n\|_{L_t^q \dot{H}_x^{1,r}}.$$

Here $H^{1,r}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and $\dot{H}^{1,r}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ denote the inhomogeneous and homogeneous L^r Sobolev spaces, respectively, equipped with the norms

$$\|f\|_{H^{1,r}} = \|\langle \nabla \rangle\|_{L^r(\mathbf{R}^d)}, \quad \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{1,r}} = \||\nabla| f\|_{L^r(\mathbf{R}^d)}.$$

Proposition 4.2 (Inverse Strichartz)**.** *Let I be a compact interval containing 0 of length at most δ_0, and suppose f_n is a sequence of functions in $Q(H)$ satisfying*

$$0 < \varepsilon \leq \|e^{-itH} f_n\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2(d+2)}{d-2}}(I \times \mathbf{R}^d)} \lesssim \|H^{1/2} f_n\|_{L^2} \leq A < \infty.$$

Then, after passing to a subsequence, there exists an augmented frame

$$\mathcal{F} = \{(t_n, x_n, N_n, N_n')\}$$

and a sequence of functions $\phi_n \in Q(H)$ such that one of the following holds:

1. *$\mathcal{F}$ is of type 1 (i.e. $N_n \equiv 1$) and $\phi_n = \phi$ where $\phi \in Q(H)$ is a weak limit of f_n in $Q(H)$.*
2. *$\mathcal{F}$ is of type 2, either $t_n \equiv 0$ or $N_n^2 t_n \to \pm\infty$, and $\phi_n = e^{it_n H} G_n S_n \phi$ where $\phi \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is a weak limit of $G_n^{-1} e^{-it_n H} f_n$ in $\dot{H}^1$. Moreover, if $\mathcal{F}$ is of type (2a), then ϕ also belongs to $L^2(\mathbf{R}^d)$.*

The functions ϕ_n have the following properties:

$$\liminf_n \|H^{1/2} \phi_n\|_{L^2} \gtrsim A \left(\tfrac{\varepsilon}{A}\right)^{\frac{d(d+2)}{8}} \tag{4.4}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|f_n\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}}^{\frac{2d}{d-2}} - \|f_n - \phi_n\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}}^{\frac{2d}{d-2}} - \|\phi_n\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}}^{\frac{2d}{d-2}} = 0. \tag{4.5}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|H^{1/2} f_n\|_{L^2}^2 - \|H^{1/2}(f_n - \phi_n)\|_{L^2}^2 - \|H^{1/2}\phi_n\|_{L^2}^2 = 0 \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. We recall that the proof of the analogous result in [15, Section 4.1] used the following ingredients:

- Littlewood-Paley theory adapted to the operator $H = -\frac{1}{2}\Delta + \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$, which relied heavily on Theorem 2.5.
- A refined Strichartz inequality, proved using the Littlewood-Paley theory.
- Convergence properties of *equivalent* and *orthogonal* frames, in particular, the comparison of the linear flows generated by the Hamiltonians for the free particle and the harmonic oscillator, when acting on concentrated initial data. This was the only place in the proof that relied on the exact form of Mehler's formula (1.6).

The reader will easily verify that adapting the first two to our situation requires little more than replacing all instances of $|x|^2/2$ in the proofs with V. In the following section, we supply the details for the third. Once suitable analogues for these components are obtained, the rest of the proof carries over without difficulty, and we refer the reader to [15] for the details. □

Proposition 4.3 (Linear profile decomposition)**.** *Let $0 \in I$ be an interval with $|I| \leq \delta_0$, and let f_n be a bounded sequence in $Q(H)$. After passing to a subsequence, there exists $J^* \in \{0, 1, \dots\} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that for each finite $1 \leq j \leq J^*$, there exist an augmented frame $\mathcal{F}^j = \{(t_n^j, x_n^j, N_n^j, (N_n^j)')\}$ and a function ϕ^j with the following properties.*

- *Either $t_n^j \equiv 0$ or $(N_n^j)^2(t_n^j) \to \pm\infty$ as $n \to \infty$.*
- *ϕ^j belongs to $Q(H)$, H^1, or $\dot{H}^1$ depending on whether $\mathcal{F}^j$ is of type 1, (2a), or (2b), respectively.*

For each finite $J \leq J^*$, we have a decomposition

$$f_n = \sum_{j=1}^{J} e^{it_n^j H} G_n^j S_n^j \phi^j + r_n^J, \tag{4.7}$$

where G_n^j, S_n^j are the $\dot H^1$-isometry and spatial cutoff operators associated to $\mathcal{F}^j$. Writing ϕ_n^j for $e^{it_n^j H} G_n^j S_n^j \phi^j$, this decomposition has the following properties:

$$(G_n^J)^{-1} e^{-it_n^J H} r_n^J \overset{\dot H^1}{\rightharpoonup} 0 \quad \text{for all } J \le J^*, \tag{4.8}$$

$$\sup_J \lim_{n\to\infty} \Big| \|H^{1/2} f_n\|_{L^2}^2 - \sum_{j=1}^J \|H^{1/2}\phi_n^j\|_{L^2}^2 - \|H^{1/2} r_n^J\|_{L^2}^2 \Big| = 0, \tag{4.9}$$

$$\sup_J \lim_{n\to\infty} \Big| \|f_n\|_{L_x^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}}^{\frac{2d}{d-2}} - \sum_{j=1}^J \|\phi_n^j\|_{L_x^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}}^{\frac{2d}{d-2}} - \|r_n^J\|_{L_x^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}}^{\frac{2d}{d-2}} \Big| = 0. \tag{4.10}$$

Whenever $j \neq k$, the frames $\{(t_n^j, x_n^j, N_n^j)\}$ and $\{(t_n^k, x_n^k, N_n^k)\}$ are orthogonal:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \tfrac{N_n^j}{N_n^k} + \tfrac{N_n^k}{N_n^j} + N_n^j N_n^k |t_n^j - t_n^k| + \sqrt{N_n^j N_n^k} |x_n^j - x_n^k| = \infty. \tag{4.11}$$

Finally, we have

$$\lim_{J\to J^*} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \|e^{-it_n H} r_n^J\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2(d+2)}{d-2}}} = 0, \tag{4.12}$$

Proof. The argument is similar to the one for as in [15, Proposition 4.14]. One inductively applies inverse Strichartz to extract the frames $\mathcal{F}^j$ and profiles ϕ^j. To prove the decoupling assertion (4.11), one uses the convergence lemmas discussed in the next section, which completely parallel the ones used in [15]. □

Remark. When $H = -\frac{1}{2}\Delta + \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$, one can improve (4.9) to

$$\Big| \|Df_n\|_{L^2}^2 - \sum_{j=1}^J \|D\phi_n^j\|_{L^2}^2 - \|Dr_n^J\|_{L^2}^2 \Big| \to 0$$

$$\Big| \|Xf_n\|_{L^2}^2 - \sum_{j=1}^J \|X\phi_n^j\|_{L^2}^2 - \|Xr_n^J\|_{L^2}^2 \Big| \to 0.$$

The proof of this relies on the fact that e^{-itH} conjugates D and X according to Heisenberg's equations. We used this stronger assertion to treat the focusing equation in an earlier draft of [15], but were unable to extend it to the present setting. It would be interesting to know whether one has separate decoupling of kinetic and potential energies for more general potentials.

4.1. **Convergence of linear propagators.** The main purpose of this section is to prove Proposition 4.4. Although the result is phrased as a property of "equivalent frames" (to be defined shortly), it can be regarded as a comparison of the linear evolutions $e^{-itH}\phi$ and $e^{\frac{it\Delta}{2}}\phi$ as ϕ concentrates at a point.

While the proposition is simply a translation of [15, Lemma 4.8], its proof is more involved and requires a closer study of the underlying classical dynamics.

Definition 4.3. We say two frames $\mathcal{F}^1 = \{(t_n^1, x_n^1, N_n^1)\}$ and $\mathcal{F}^2 = \{(t_n^2, x_n^2, N_n^2)\}$ (where the superscripts are indices, not exponents) are *equivalent* if

$$\tfrac{N_n^1}{N_n^2} \to R_\infty \in (0,\infty),\ N_n^1(x_n^2 - x_n^1) \to x_\infty \in \mathbf{R}^d,\ (N_n^1)^2(t_n^1 - t_n^2) \to t_\infty \in \mathbf{R}.$$

If any of the above statements fail, we say that $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ are *orthogonal*. Note that replacing the N_n^1 in the second and third expressions above by N_n^2 yields an equivalent definition of orthogonality.

Two augmented frames are said to be equivalent if their underlying frames are equivalent.

Proposition 4.4 (Strong convergence)**.** *Suppose $\mathcal{F}^M = (t_n^M, x_n, M_n)$ and $\mathcal{F}^N = (t_n^N, y_n, N_n)$ are equivalent frames. Define*

$$R_\infty = \lim_{n\to\infty} \tfrac{M_n}{N_n} \qquad t_\infty = \lim_{n\to\infty} M_n^2(t_n^M - t_n^N),$$
$$x_\infty = \lim_{n\to\infty} M_n(y_n - x_n), \quad r_\infty = \lim_n M_n^{-1} V(x_n)^{1/2};$$

(The last limit exists by the definition of a frame.) Let G_n^M, G_n^N be the scaling and translation operators associated with the frames $\mathcal{F}^M$ and $\mathcal{F}^N$ respectively. Then the sequence $(e^{-it_n^N H} G_n^N)^{-1} e^{-it_n^M H} G_n^M$ converges in the strong operator topology on $B(\Sigma, \Sigma)$ to the operator U_∞ defined by

$$U_\infty \phi = e^{-it_\infty (r_\infty)^2} R_\infty^{\frac{d-2}{2}} [e^{\frac{it_\infty \Delta}{2}} \phi](R_\infty \cdot + x_\infty).$$

Proof. Write $(e^{-it_n^N H} G_n^N)^{-1} e^{-it_n^M H} G_n^M = (G_n^N)^{-1} G_n^M (G_n^M) e^{-it_n H} G_n^M$ where $t_n = t_n^M - t_n^M$. As $(G_n^N)^{-1} G_n^M$ converges strongly to the operator $f \mapsto R_\infty^{\frac{d-2}{2}} f(R_\infty \cdot + x_\infty)$, it suffices to show that

$$(G_n^M)^{-1} e^{-it_n H} G_n^M \to e^{-it_\infty (r_\infty)^2} e^{\frac{it_\infty \Delta}{2}}. \tag{4.13}$$

This is what we shall do.

We proceed in two steps. Recall from Theorem 2.2 that the phase in the Fourier integral formula for e^{-itH} is the classical action and has the form

$$S(t, x, y) = \tfrac{|x-y|^2}{2t} + t\omega(t, x, y), \quad \omega(t, \cdot, \cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_2.$$

First we extract the lowest order term from the remainder. This additional information will reveal the limit of the sequence once everything has been expressed in terms of oscillatory integrals. Convergence will then follow from the oscillatory integral theory of Section 2.2.

The leading terms of the action will be obtained by replacing the classical trajectories with straight lines in the integral (2.2). Proceeding in the spirit of Fujiwara [9], we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $H(\xi, x) = \frac{1}{2}|\xi|^2 + V(x)$ with V subquadratic, and let $S(t, x, y)$ be the action (which is well-defined for all x and y so long as $|t| \le \delta_0$ where δ_0 is the constant in Theorem 2.2). Then*

$$S(t, x, y) = \frac{|x-y|^2}{2t} - \int_0^t V(y + (\tfrac{x-y}{t})\tau)\, d\tau + O\Big(t^3(1 + |x|^2 + |y|^2)\Big).$$

Proof. Start by rewriting the ODE system (2.1) in integral form:

$$\begin{aligned} \xi(t) &= \eta - \int_0^t \partial_x V(x(\theta))\, d\theta, \\ x(t) &= y + \int_0^t \xi(\tau) d\tau = y + t\eta - \int_0^t (t-\theta)\partial_x V(x(\theta))\, d\theta. \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

As $\partial_x V$ grows at most linearly, Gronwall's inequality implies that for all initial data y, η we have

$$|x(t)| \le C(1 + |y| + |t\eta|).$$

Fix a time $t > 0$ and positions $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^d$. By Proposition 2.1, there is a unique initial velocity $\eta = \eta(t, x, y)$ such that the solution $(x(\tau), \xi(\tau))$ to (4.14) satisfies $x(0) = y$ and $x(t) = x$.

Referring to the definition (2.2) of the action, we estimate the error incurred by replacing the true trajectory by the straight line path from y to x. Rearranging the above expression for $x(t)$, we have

$$\eta = \frac{x-y}{t} + \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t (t-\theta)\partial_x V(x(\theta))\,d\theta. \tag{4.15}$$

For τ between 0 and t,

$$|x(\tau)| \le |y| + \Big|\frac{x-y}{t}\tau\Big| + C\int_0^t |t-\theta|(1+|x(\theta)|)\,d\theta,$$

hence $|x(\tau)| \le C(1+|x|+|y|)$. The preceding computations reveal that

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|x(\tau) - y - \tau(\frac{x-y}{t})\Big| &\le \frac{\tau}{t}\int_0^t |t-\theta||\partial_x V(x(\theta))|\,d\theta + \int_0^\tau |\tau-\theta||\partial_x V(x(\theta))|\,d\theta \\ &\le C(\tau t + \tau^2)(1+|x|+|y|).\end{aligned}$$

By the fundamental theorem of calculus,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^t |V(x(\tau)) - V(y+\tau(\tfrac{x-y}{t}))|\,d\tau &\le C\int_0^t (\tau t+\tau^2)(1+|x|+|y|)^2 d\tau \\ &\le Ct^3(1+|x|+|y|)^2.\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

Next, by combining the first line of (4.14) with (4.15), we find that

$$\xi(\tau) = \frac{x-y}{t} + \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t (t-\theta)\partial_x V(x(\theta))\,d\theta - \int_0^\tau \partial_x V(x(\theta))\,d\theta.$$

It is easy to see that second and third terms are bounded by $O(t(1+|x|+|y|))$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^t \frac{1}{2}|\xi(\tau)|^2\,d\tau &= \frac{|x-y|^2}{2t} + \frac{x-y}{t}\int_0^t (t-\theta)\partial_x V(x(\theta))\,d\theta \\ &\quad - \frac{x-y}{t}\int_0^t\int_0^\tau \partial_x V(x(\theta))\,d\theta d\tau + O(t^3(1+|x|+|y|)^2) \\ &= \frac{|x-y|^2}{2t} + O(t^3(1+|x|+|y|)^2).\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (4.16) establishes the lemma. □

By Theorem 2.2 and a change of variable,

$$(G_n^M)^{-1} e^{-it_n H} G_n^M f(x) = \Big(\frac{\lambda_n}{2\pi i}\Big)^{\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} e^{i\lambda_n \phi_n(x,y)} a_n(x,y) f(y)\,dy, \tag{4.17}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_n &= (M_n^2 t_n)^{-1} \\ a_n(x,y) &= a(t_n, x_n + M_n^{-1}x, x_n + M_n^{-1}y) \\ \phi_n(x,y) &= \tfrac{1}{2}|x-y|^2 + \lambda_n^{-1} t_n \omega(t_n, x_n + M_n^{-1}x, x_n + M_n^{-1}y) \\ &= \phi_0(x,y) + \lambda_n^{-1} t_n \omega_n(x,y).\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2.2 and Lemma 4.5 imply that these quantities obey the following estimates:

(4.18)

$$t_n\omega_n(x,y) = -\int_0^{t_n} V(x_n + M_n^{-1}y + \tfrac{x-y}{M_n t_n}\tau)\,d\tau + O(t_n^3(|x_n|^2 + M_n^{-2}|x|^2 + M_n^{-2}|y|^2))$$
$$= -t_n V_n(x_n) + O(M_n^{-2}(1+|x|^2+|y|^2)),$$
$$|D_{x,y}^k \omega_n(x,y)| \lesssim \begin{cases} M_n^{-1}(1+|x_n+M_n^{-1}x| + |x_n+M_n^{-1}y|), & k=1 \\ M_n^{-k}, & k \geq 2 \end{cases}$$
$$|D_{x,y}^m[a_n(x,y)-1]| \lesssim_k M_n^{-2-k} \quad \text{for all} \quad k \geq 0.$$

We need the following adaptation of [9, Proposition 4.15].

Lemma 4.6. *The operators $(G_n^M)^{-1}e^{-it_nH}G_n^M$ are uniformly bounded on Σ.*

Proof. We appeal to Theorem 2.12. Let $\chi_n : (y, -\partial_y\phi_n) \mapsto (x, \partial_x\phi_n)$ be the canonical transformation generated by the phase function ϕ_n. In terms of the variables (y,η), we have

$$\chi_n(y,\eta) = (y+\eta,\eta) + \lambda_n^{-1}t_n(\partial_y\omega_n, \partial_x\omega_n + \partial_y\omega_n)(x(t_n,y,\eta),y)$$
$$= (y+\eta,\eta) + (r_{1,n}(y,\eta), r_{2,n}(y,\eta)).$$

First we show that

$$\|D(G_n^M)^{-1}e^{-it_nH}G_n^M f\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|f\|_\Sigma. \tag{4.19}$$

Put $p(x,\theta,y) = \theta$ and $q_n(x,\theta,y) = \theta + r_{2,n}(y,\theta)$. By construction,

$$p(x,\xi,x)|_{(x,\xi)=\chi_n(y,\eta)} = q_n(y,\eta,y).$$

By the representation (4.17) and Theorem 2.12,

$$\begin{aligned} D(G_n^M)^{-1}e^{-it_nH}G_n^M &= \operatorname{Op}(\lambda_n p, \lambda_n)(G_n^M)^{-1}e^{-it_nH}G_n^M \\ &= (G_n^M)^{-1}e^{-it_nH}G_n^M \operatorname{Op}(\lambda_n q_n, \lambda_n) + R_n(\lambda_n). \end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

In light of the estimates (4.18) and Theorem 2.11, it suffices to obtain a uniform bound

$$\|\operatorname{Op}(\lambda_n q_n, \lambda_n)\|_{\Sigma \to L^2} \lesssim 1$$

By definition

$$\operatorname{Op}(\lambda_n q_n, \lambda_n)f(x) = Df + \operatorname{Op}(\lambda_n r_{2,n}, \lambda_n).$$

Using (4.18) and Proposition 2.1, we see that

$$\lambda_n r_{2,y}(y,\eta) = t_n(\partial_x\omega_n + \partial_y\omega_n)(t_n, x(t_n,0,0),0)$$
$$+ t_n y\int_0^1 (\partial_{xy}^2\omega_n)(t_n, x(t_n,sy,s\eta),sy)\tfrac{\partial x}{\partial y} + (\partial_y^2\omega_n)(t_n, x(t_n,sy,s\eta),sy)\,ds$$
$$+ t_n\eta\int_0^1 (\partial_{xy}^2\omega_n)(t_n, x(t_n,sy,s\eta),sy)\tfrac{\partial x}{\partial \eta}\,ds$$
$$= c_n + y r_{2,n}^1(y,\eta) + \eta r_{2,n}^2(y,\eta),$$

where $|c_n| \lesssim M_n^{-2}$ and $\|D^k r_{2,n}^1\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim M_n^{-4}$, $\|D^k r_{2,n}^2\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim M_n^{-6}$ for all k. Thus

$$\operatorname{Op}(\lambda_n r_{2,n}, \lambda_n) = c_n I + \operatorname{Op}(y r_{2,n}^1(y,\eta), \lambda_n) + \operatorname{Op}(\eta r_{2,n}^2(y,\eta), \lambda_n)$$
$$= c_n I + \operatorname{Op}(r_{2,n}^1, \lambda_n)X + \operatorname{Op}(\lambda_n^{-1}r_{2,n}^2, \lambda_n)D + \operatorname{Op}(\lambda_n^{-1}(D_y r_{2,n}^2), \lambda_n).$$

The Calderón-Vaillancourt theorem [3] now implies

$$\| \operatorname{Op}(\lambda_n r_{2,n}, \lambda_n) f\|_{L^2} \lesssim M_n^{-2}\|f\|_{L^2} + M_n^{-4}\|Xf\|_{L^2} + M_n^{-6}\|Df\|_{L^2} \lesssim M_n^{-2}\|f\|_{\Sigma}.$$

Altogether we obtain (4.19).

By setting $p(x,\theta,y) = x,\ q(x,\theta,y) = y + \theta + r_{1,n}(y,\eta)$ and making a similar analysis as above, we obtain

$$\|X(G_n^M)^{-1} e^{-it_n H} G_n^M f\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|f\|_{\Sigma}.$$

This concludes the proof of the lemma. □

We now verify the limit (4.13). As $e^{\frac{iM_n^2 t_n \Delta}{2}} \to e^{\frac{it_\infty \Delta}{2}}$ strongly, it suffices to show that

$$(G_n^M)^{-1} e^{-it_n H} G_n^M f - e^{-it_\infty (r_\infty)^2} e^{\frac{iM_n^2 t_n \Delta}{2}} f$$

converges to 0 for all $f \in \Sigma$. By Lemma 4.6 we may assume $f \in C_c^\infty$. The above difference may be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\tfrac{\lambda_n}{2\pi i}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} \int e^{i\lambda_n \phi_n}[a_n - 1] f(y)\, dy + \left(\tfrac{\lambda_n}{2\pi i}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} \int [e^{i\lambda_n \phi_n} - e^{-it_\infty (r_\infty)^2} e^{i\lambda_n \phi_0}] f(y)\, dy \\ = A_n f + B_n f.\end{aligned}$$

Using Theorem 2.11 and the estimates (4.18), one argues as in the proof of Lemma 4.6 to see that $\|A_n f\|_\Sigma \lesssim M_n^{-2}\|f\|_\Sigma$.

It remains to bound $B_n f$. By hypothesis f is supported in some ball $B(0,R)$, and the estimates (4.18) show that the integral kernel of B_n converges to 0 in C^∞_{loc}. It follows that $|xB_n f|$ and $|\nabla B_n f|$ converge to 0 locally uniformly. On the other hand, integration by parts reveals that for all n sufficiently large,

$$|xB_n f| + |\nabla B_n f| \lesssim_N |x|^{-N}$$

for any $N > 0$ and for all $|x| \geq 4R$. Hence $\|B_n f\|_\Sigma \to 0$ by dominated convergence. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

In the remainder of this section we collect other lemmata regarding equivalent and orthogonal frames. They can be proved in much the same manner as their counterparts in [15, Section 4.2].

Corollary 4.7. *Let $\{(t_n^M, x_n, M_n, M_n')\}$ and $\{t_n^N, y_n, N_n, N_n')\}$ be equivalent augmented frames. Let S_n^M, S_n^N be the associated spatial cutoff operators. Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|e^{-it_n^M H} G_n^M S_n^M \phi - e^{-it_n^N H} G_n^N S_n^N U_\infty \phi\|_\Sigma = 0 \tag{4.21}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|e^{-it_n^M H} G_n^M S_n^M \phi - e^{-it_n^N H} G_n^N U_\infty S_n^N \phi\|_\Sigma = 0 \tag{4.22}$$

whenever $\phi \in H^1$ if the frames conform to case (2a) and $\phi \in \dot H^1$ if they conform to case (2b) in Definition 4.2.

Proof. Run an approximation argument using Lemma 4.1 in the manner of [15, Corollary 4.9]. □

The following "approximate adjoint" identity is the analogue of [15, Lemma 4.10].

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose the frames $\{(t_n^M, x_n, M_n)\}$ and $\{(t_n^N, y_n, N_n)\}$ are equivalent. Put $t_n = t_n^M - t_n^N$. Then for $f, g \in \Sigma$ we have*

$$\langle (G_n^N)^{-1} e^{-it_n H} G_n^M f, g\rangle_{\dot{H}^1} = \langle f, (G_n^M)^{-1} e^{it_n H} G_n^N g\rangle_{\dot{H}^1} + R_n(f,g),$$

where $|R_n(f,g)| \leq C|t_n| \|G_n^M f\|_\Sigma \|G_n^N g\|_\Sigma$.

Proof. The proof of Lemma 4.6 yields the following commutator estimate:

$$\|[D, e^{-itH}]\|_{\Sigma \to L^2} = O(t).$$

We have

$$\langle D(G_n^N)^{-1} e^{-it_n H} G_n^M f, Dg\rangle_{L^2} = \langle Df, D(G_n^M)^{-1} e^{it_n H} G_n^N g\rangle_{L^2} + R_n(f,g)$$

where $R_n(f,g) = \langle [D, e^{-it_n H}] G_n^M f, DG_n^N g\rangle_{L^2} - \langle DG_n^M f, [D, e^{it_n H}] G_n^N g\rangle_{L^2}$. The claim then follows from Cauchy-Schwarz and the above estimate. □

The next lemma is a converse to Proposition 4.4.

Lemma 4.9 (Weak convergence)**.** *Assume the frames $\mathcal{F}^M = \{(t_n^M, x_n, M_n)\}$ and $\mathcal{F}^N = \{(t_n^N, y_n, N_n)\}$ are orthogonal. Then, for any $f \in \Sigma$,*

$$(e^{-it_n^N H} G_n^N)^{-1} e^{-it_n^M H} G_n^M f \to 0 \quad \textit{weakly in} \quad \dot{H}^1.$$

Proof. Put $t_n = t_n^M - t_n^N$, and suppose that $|M_n^2 t_n| \to \infty$. Then

$$\|(G_n^N)^{-1} e^{-it_n H} G_n^M f\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}} \to 0$$

for $f \in C_c^\infty$ by a change of variables and the dispersive estimate, thus for general $f \in \Sigma$ by a density argument. Therefore $(G_n^N)^{-1} e^{-it_n H} G_n^M f$ converges weakly in $\dot{H}^1$ to 0. We consider next the case where $M_n^2 t_n \to t_\infty \in \mathbf{R}$. The orthogonality of $\mathcal{F}^M$ and $\mathcal{F}^N$ implies that either $N_n^{-1} M_n$ converges to 0 or ∞, or $M_n |x_n - y_n|$ diverges as $n \to \infty$. In either case, one verifies easily that the operators $(G_n^N)^{-1} G_n^M$ converge to zero in the weak operator topology on $B(\dot{H}^1, \dot{H}^1)$. Applying Proposition 4.4, we see that $(G_n^N)^{-1} e^{-it_n H} G_n^M f = (G_n^N)^{-1} G_n^M (G_n^M)^{-1} e^{-it_n H} G_n^M f$ converges to zero weakly in $\dot{H}^1$. □

Corollary 4.10. *Let $\{(t_n^M, x_n, M_n, M_n')\}$ and $\{(t_n^N, y_n, N_n, N_n')\}$ be augmented frames such that $\{(t_n^M, x_n, M_n)\}$ and $\{(t_n^N, y_n, N_n)\}$ are orthogonal. Let G_n^M, S_n^M and G_n^N, S_n^N be the associated operators. Then*

$$(e^{-it_n^N H} G_n^N)^{-1} e^{-it_n^M H} G_n^M S_n^M \phi \rightharpoonup 0 \quad \textit{in} \quad \dot{H}^1$$

whenever $\phi \in H^1$ if $\mathcal{F}^M$ is of type (2a) and $\phi \in \dot{H}^1$ if $\mathcal{F}^M$ is of type (2b).

Proof. If $\phi \in C_c^\infty$, then $S_n^M \phi = \phi$ for all large n, and the claim follows from Lemma 4.9. The case of general ϕ in H^1 or $\dot{H}^1$ then follows from an approximation argument similar to the one used in the proof of Corollary 4.7. □

5. The case of concentrated initial data

With the main complications of this paper behind us, we sketch the rest of the wellposedness argument in the remaining two sections. The next step is to rule out blowup for equation (1.2) when the initial data is highly concentrated in space.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $I = [-\delta_0/2, \delta_0/2]$, where δ_0 is the constant in Theorem 2.2. Assume that Conjecture 1.1 holds. Let*

$$\mathcal{F} = \{(t_n, x_n, N_n, N_n')\}$$

be an augmented frame with $t_n \in I$ and $N_n \to \infty$, such that either $t_n \equiv 0$ or $N_n^2 t_n \to \pm\infty$; that is, $\mathcal{F}$ is type (2a) or (2b) in Definition 4.2. Let $G_n, \tilde{G}_n$, and S_n be the associated operators as defined in (4.1) *and* (4.2)*. Suppose ϕ belongs to H^1 or $\dot{H}^1$ depending on whether $\mathcal{F}$ is type (2a) or (2b) respectively. Then, for n sufficiently large, there is a unique solution $u_n : I \times \mathbf{R}^d \to \mathbf{C}$ to the defocusing equation* (1.2)*, $\mu = 1$, with initial data*

$$u_n(0) = e^{it_n H} G_n S_n \phi.$$

This solution satisfies a spacetime bound

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} S_I(u_n) \leq C(E(u_n)).$$

Suppose in addition that $\{(q_k, r_k)\}$ is any finite collection of admissible pairs with $2 < r_k < d$. Then for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\psi^\varepsilon \in C_c^\infty(\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^d)$ such that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_k \|H^{1/2}(u_n - \tilde{G}_n[e^{-itN_n^{-2}V(x_n)}\psi^\varepsilon])\|_{L_t^{q_k} L_x^{r_k}(I\times\mathbf{R}^d)} < \varepsilon. \tag{5.1}$$

Assuming also that $\|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$ and $E_\Delta(\phi) < E_\Delta(W)$, we have the same conclusion as above for the focusing equation (1.2)*, $\mu = -1$.*

Proof sketch. We only give a rough idea as one can proceed just as in Proposition 5 of [15] and replace every instance of $|x_n|^2/2$ wih $V(x_n)$. The idea is to show that for n large enough, one can fashion a sufficiently accurate approximate solution $\tilde{u}_n$ on the interval I in the sense of Proposition 3.3, such that $S_I(\tilde{u}_n)$ are bounded. This bound will then be transferred to the exact solution u_n by the stability theory.

While u_n remains highly concentrated (over time scales on the order of N_n^{-2}), it will be approximated by a modified solution to the scale-invariant equation (1.3) (whose solutions admit global spacetime bounds). By the time this approximation breaks down, the solution u_n will have dispersed to such an extent that the evolution of u_n is essentially linear.

We make this heuristic precise. If $t_n \equiv 0$, let v be the global solution to (1.3) furnished by Conjecture 1.1 with $v(0) = \phi$. If $N_n^2 t_n \to \pm\infty$, let v be the (unique) solution to (1.3) which scatters in $\dot{H}^1$ to $e^{\frac{it\Delta}{2}}\phi$ as $t \to \mp\infty$. Note the reversal of signs.

The approximate solution is obtained as follows. Let $\tilde{G}_n$, S_n be the frame operators as defined in (4.1) and (4.2), and define for each n a Littlewood-Paley cutoff

$$P_{\leq \tilde{N}_n'} = \varphi(-\Delta/(\tilde{N}_n')^2), \quad \tilde{N}_n' = (\tfrac{N_n}{N_n'})^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $\varphi : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}$ denotes a smooth function equal to 1 on the ball $B(0,1)$ and supported in $B(0, 1.1)$. Fix a large $T > 0$, and define

$$\tilde{v}_n^T(t) = \begin{cases} e^{-itV(x_n)}\tilde{G}_n[S_n P_{\leq \tilde{N}_n'} v](t + t_n) & |t| \leq TN_n^{-2} \\ e^{-i(t-TN_n^{-2})H}\tilde{v}_n^T(TN_n^{-2}), & TN_n^{-2} \leq t \leq \delta_0 \\ e^{-i(t+TN_n^{-2})H}\tilde{v}_n^T(-TN_n^{-2}), & -\delta_0 \leq t \leq -TN_n^{-2} \end{cases}. \tag{5.2}$$

Inside the "window of concentration", $\tilde{v}_n^T$ is essentially a modulated solution to (1.3) with cutoffs applied in both space, to place the solution in $C_t\Sigma_x$, and

frequency, to enable taking an extra derivative in the error analysis for the stability theory. The time translation by t_n is needed to undo the time translation built into the operator $\tilde{G}_n$; see (4.1).

Essentially the same computations as in [15] yield the estimate

$$\limsup_n \|H^{1/2}\tilde{v}_n^T\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2([-\delta_0,\delta_0])} + \|\tilde{v}_n^T\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2(d+2)}{d-2}}([-\delta_0,\delta_0]\times\mathbf{R}^d)} \lesssim C(\|\phi\|_{\dot{H}^1}),$$

uniformly in T; one also sees that

$$\lim_{T\to\infty}\limsup_n \|H^{1/2}[(i\partial_t - H)(\tilde{v}_n^T) - F(\tilde{v}_n^T)]\|_{N([-\delta_0,\delta_0])} = 0,$$

where $F(z) = \mu|z|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}z$ is the nonlinearity.

$$\lim_{T\to\infty}\limsup_n \|H^{1/2}[\tilde{v}_n^T(-t_n) - u_n(0)]\|_{L_x^2} = 0.$$

Thus, for some fixed large T and all large n, $\tilde{u}_n(t,x) := \tilde{v}_n^T(t-t_n,x)$ is an approximate solution on the time interval $[-\delta_0/2,\delta_0/2]$ in the sense of Proposition 3.3. Thus one obtains the first part of Proposition 5.1. The last claim regarding approximation by smooth functions is proven by applying Lemma 4.1 to the functions $\tilde{v}_n^T$ in the manner of [15, Lemma 5.6]. □

6. A compactness property for blowup sequences

In this section we state a Palais-Smale condition on sequences of blowing up solutions to (1.2). This will quickly lead to the proof of Theorem 1.3.

For a maximal solution u to (1.2), define

$$S_*(u) = \sup\{S_I(u) : I \text{ is an open interval with } |I| \le 1\},$$

where we set $S_I(u) = \infty$ if u is not defined on I. All solutions in this section are assumed to be maximal. Set

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_d(E) &= \sup\{S_*(u) : u \text{ solves (1.1), } \mu = +1,\ E(u) = E\}\\ \Lambda_f(E) &= \sup\{S_*(u,L) : u \text{ solves (1.1), } \mu = -1,\ E(u) = E,\\ &\qquad \|\nabla u(0)\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, define

$$\mathcal{E}_d = \{E : \Lambda_d(E) < \infty\}, \quad \mathcal{E}_f = \{E : \Lambda_f(E) < \infty\},$$

By the local theory, Theorem 1.3 is equivalent to the assertions

$$\mathcal{E}_d = [0,\infty), \quad \mathcal{E}_f = [0, E_\Delta(W)).$$

Suppose Theorem 1.3 failed. By the small data theory, $\mathcal{E}_d$, $\mathcal{E}_f$ are nonempty and open, and the failure of Theorem 1.3 implies the existence of a critical energy $E_c > 0$, with $E_c < E_\Delta(W)$ in the focusing case such that $\Lambda_d(E)$, $\Lambda_f(E) = \infty$ for $E > E_c$ and $\Lambda_d(E)$, $\Lambda_f(E) < \infty$ for all $E < E_c$. We have the following compactness property.

Proposition 6.1 (Palais-Smale)**.** *Assume Conjecture 1.1 holds. Suppose that* $u_n : (t_n - \delta_0, t_n + \delta_0)\times\mathbf{R}^d \to \mathbf{C}$ *is a sequence of solutions with*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E(u_n) = E_c, \ \lim_{n\to\infty} S_{(t_n-\delta_0,t_n]}(u_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} S_{[t_n,t_n+\delta_0)}(u_n) = \infty,$$

where δ_0 is the constant in Theorem 2.2. In the focusing case, assume also that $E_c < E_\Delta(W)$ and $\|\nabla u_n(t_n)\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$. Then there exists a subsequence such that $u_n(t_n)$ converges in $Q(H)$.

Proof. We refer to the presentation following Proposition 6.1 in [15]. The proof uses a local smoothing estimate for the propagator e^{-itH}, which can be obtained just as in Corollary 2.10 of [15]. In the focusing case, one also uses energy trapping arguments (see Section 7 of [15]) to see that the hypotheses are in fact equivalent to $\|H^{1/2}u_n(t_n)\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Suppose the theorem failed, and let E_c be as above. Then, after applying suitable time translations, there is a sequence of solutions u_n with $E(u_n) \to E_c$ and $S_{(-\delta_0/4,\delta_0/4)}(u_n) \to \infty$. Choose t_n such that $S_{(-\delta_0/4,t_n)}(u_n) = \frac{1}{2}S_{(-\delta_0/4,\delta_0/4)}(u_n)$. By Proposition 6.1, after passing to a subsequence we have $\|u(t_n) - \phi\|_\Sigma \to 0$ for some $\phi \in \Sigma$. Then $E(\phi) = \lim_n E(\phi_n) = E_c$.

Let $v : (-T_{min}, T_{max})$ be the maximum-lifespan solution to (1.2) with $v(0) = \phi$. By comparing $v(t, x)$ with the solutions $u_n(t + t_n, x)$ and applying Proposition 3.3, we see that $S_{(0,\delta_0/2)}(v) = S_{(-\delta_0/2,0)}(v) = \infty$. Thus $-\delta_0/2 \le -T_{min} < T_{max} \le \delta_0/2$. But the orbit $\{v(t)\}_{t\in(-T_{min},T_{max})}$ is a precompact subset of Σ, by Proposition 6.1, so there is some sequence of times t_n increasing to T_{max} such that $v(t_n)$ converges in Σ to some ψ. By considering a local solution with initial data ψ and invoking stability theory, we see that v can actually be extended to some larger interval $(-T_{min}, T_{max} + \eta)$, in contradiction to the maximality of v. □

References

[1] Kenji Asada and Daisuke Fujiwara. On some oscillatory integral transformations in $L^2(\mathbf{R}^n)$. *Japan. J. Math. (N.S.)*, 4(2):299–361, 1978.

[2] J. Bourgain. Global wellposedness of defocusing critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in the radial case. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 12(1):145–171, 1999.

[3] Alberto-P. Calderón and Rémi Vaillancourt. On the boundedness of pseudo-differential operators. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 23:374–378, 1971.

[4] Rémi Carles. Rotating points for the conformal NLS scattering operator. *Dyn. Partial Differ. Equ.*, 6(1):35–51, 2009.

[5] Rémi Carles. Nonlinear schrödinger equation with time-dependent potential. *Commun. Math Sci.*, 9(4):937–964, 2011.

[6] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka, and T. Tao. Global well-posedness and scattering for the energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in $\mathbb{R}^3$. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 167(3):767–865, 2008.

[7] Gerald B. Folland. *Harmonic analysis in phase space*, volume 122 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1989.

[8] Daisuke Fujiwara. On the boundedness of integral transformations with highly oscillatory kernels. *Proc. Japan Acad.*, 51:96–99, 1975.

[9] Daisuke Fujiwara. A construction of the fundamental solution for the Schrödinger equation. *J. Analyse Math.*, 35:41–96, 1979.

[10] Daisuke Fujiwara. Remarks on convergence of the Feynman path integrals. *Duke Math. J.*, 47(3):559–600, 1980.

[11] Waldemar Hebisch. A multiplier theorem for Schrödinger operators. *Colloq. Math.*, 60/61(2):659–664, 1990.

[12] Alexandru D. Ionescu and Benoit Pausader. The energy-critical defocusing NLS on $\mathbb{T}^3$. *Duke Math. J.*, 161(8):1581–1612, 2012.

[13] Alexandru D. Ionescu and Benoit Pausader. Global well-posedness of the energy-critical defocusing NLS on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^3$. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 312(3):781–831, 2012.

[14] Alexandru D. Ionescu, Benoit Pausader, and Gigliola Staffilani. On the global well-posedness of energy-critical Schrödinger equations in curved spaces. *Anal. PDE*, 5(4):705–746, 2012.

[15] Casey Jao. The energy-critical quantum harmonic oscillator. 2014. preprint, arxiv:1406.2289.
[16] Markus Keel and Terence Tao. Endpoint Strichartz estimates. *Amer. J. Math.*, 120(5):955–980, 1998.
[17] Carlos E. Kenig and Frank Merle. Global well-posedness, scattering and blow-up for the energy-critical, focusing, non-linear Schrödinger equation in the radial case. *Invent. Math.*, 166(3):645–675, 2006.
[18] Sahbi Keraani. On the blow up phenomenon of the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 235(1):171–192, 2006.
[19] Rowan Killip, Soonsik Kwon, Shuanglin Shao, and Monica Visan. On the mass-critical generalized KdV equation. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 32(1):191–221, 2012.
[20] Rowan Killip, Betsy Stovall, and Monica Visan. Scattering for the cubic Klein-Gordon equation in two space dimensions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 364(3):1571–1631, 2012.
[21] Rowan Killip and Monica Visan. The focusing energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in dimensions five and higher. *Amer. J. Math.*, 132(2):361–424, 2010.
[22] Rowan Killip and Monica Vişan. Nonlinear Schrödinger equations at critical regularity. In *Evolution equations*, volume 17 of *Clay Math. Proc.*, pages 325–437. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2013.
[23] Rowan Killip, Monica Visan, and Xiaoyi Zhang. Energy-critical NLS with quadratic potentials. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 34(10-12):1531–1565, 2009.
[24] Rowan Killip, Monica Visan, and Xiaoyi Zhang. Quintic nls in the exterior of a strictly convex obstacle. *Preprint*, 2012.
[25] Yong-Geun Oh. Cauchy problem and Ehrenfest's law of nonlinear Schrödinger equations with potentials. *J. Differential Equations*, 81(2):255–274, 1989.
[26] E. Ryckman and M. Visan. Global well-posedness and scattering for the defocusing energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in $\mathbb{R}^{1+4}$. *Amer. J. Math.*, 129(1):1–60, 2007.
[27] Laurent Schwartz. *Théorie des distributions*. Publications de l'Institut de Mathématique de l'Université de Strasbourg, No. IX-X. Nouvelle édition, entiérement corrigée, refondue et augmentée. Hermann, Paris, 1966.
[28] Michael E. Taylor. *Tools for PDE*, volume 81 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000. Pseudodifferential operators, paradifferential operators, and layer potentials.
[29] Monica Visan. The defocusing energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in higher dimensions. *Duke Math. J.*, 138(2):281–374, 2007.